

Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 STATE 206179
ORIGIN EUR-12

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 /013 R

DRAFTED BY EUR/RPM:JCKORNBLUM
APPROVED BY EUR/RPM:JCKORNBLUM
-----104088 292133Z /66
O 292052Z AUG 77
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO USNMR SHAPE IMMEDIATE

C O N F I D E N T I A L STATE 206179

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: CSCE, NATO

SUBJECT: CSCE/CBMS: JUNE 14 POLADS MEETING

FOLLOWING IS A REPEAT
QTE
R 132343Z JUN 77
FROM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO USMISSION NATO IMMEDIATE
INFO ALL NATO CAPITALS
AMEMBASSY BELGRADE
AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
CONFIDENTIAL STATE 136929
HOLD FOR OPENING OF BUSINESS
E.O. 11652: GDS
TAGS: CSCE, NATO
SUBJECT: CSCE/CBMS: JUNE 14 POLADS MEETING
REF: (A) NATO 4985; (B) NATO 4565; (C) STATE 75283;
(D) STATE 130422

1. EUR/IG WORKING GROUP ON CSCE/CBMS HELD MEETING
JUNE 10 ON MOVEMENTS AND OTHER CBM QUESTIONS. GROUP
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 STATE 206179

EXAMINED US POSITION ON MOVEMENTS IN LIGHT OF THE FOLLOWING:

- A. IT IS INCREASINGLY CLEAR THAT ONE OR SEVERAL CBM
MOVEMENTS INITIATIVES WILL BE TABLED BY THE NNAS.
- B. MANY ALLIES HAVE INDICATED THAT THEY WISH TO ADVANCE
OR SUPPORT A MOVEMENTS INITIATIVE.

C. IT WOULD BE TO ALLIED ADVANTAGE TO SEEK TO RESPOND POSITIVELY TO AN NNA INITIATIVE AS IT COULD CAUSE THE NNAS TO ASSIST ALLIES ELSEWHERE IN THE CSCE FORUM.

D. WE EXAMINED POSSIBILITY OF A MOVEMENTS CBM IN TERMS OF:

1) ALLIED POLICY TO KEEP THE PRIMARY FOCUS ON BELGRADE ON REVIEW OF IMPLEMENTATION;

2) THE NEED TO MAINTAIN BALANCE AMONG CSCE SUBJECT AREAS IN ADVANCING OR SUPPORTING INITIATIVES.

E. US DELAY IN STATING A MOVEMENTS POSITION WILL SOON MAKE QUESTIONABLE US ARGUMENT THAT ALLIES NEED TO ORDER CBM PRIORITIES AS EARLY AS POSSIBLE (PARAGRAPH ONE OF REFTTEL C).

F. MISSION HAS NOW INDICATED NECESSITY TO INFORM ALLIES OF US THINKING ON MOVEMENTS TO ADVANCE WORK ON PRIORITIES (SUMMARY PARAGRAPH C OF REFTTEL A).

G. A MAJOR ALLY, THE FRG--AND ONE WHICH HAS A SIGNIFICANT INTEREST IN A MOVEMENTS CBM--HAS NOW REACHED A POSITION THAT ALLIES SHOULD SUPPORT A MOVEMENTS INITIATIVE WHICH NNAS ARE EXPECTED TO MAKE BUT NOT TAKE ANY INITIATIVE
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 STATE 206179

OF THEIR OWN (PARAGRAPH TEN OF REFTTEL A AND REFTTEL B).
OTHER ALLIES FAVOR A NATO INITIATIVE.

H. MILITARY COMMITTEE HAS TO DATE CONCLUDED ONLY THAT NOTIFICATION OF GROUND MOVEMENTS CONNECTED WITH A MAJOR GROUND MANEUVER IS SUPPORTABLE (PARAGRAPH 23 OF SECOND REVISED DRAFT OF ISD/141; USNATO 1735).

2. AFTER DISCUSSION OF THE ABOVE, WORKING GROUP REACHED AGREEMENT ON THE FOLLOWING STATEMENT WHICH THE MISSION MAY MAKE AT THE JUNE 14 POLADS MEETING:

A. QUOTE AFTER DISCUSSION OF SEVERAL ALTERNATIVES, WE HAVE CONCLUDED THAT WE COULD, AT THIS TIME, SUPPORT IN PRINCIPLE AN INITIATIVE BY THE NNAS TO STRENGTHEN THE FINAL ACT PROVISIONS FOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS IF ACCEPTABLE PARAMETERS FOR SUCH A PROPOSAL CAN BE DETERMINED AND AGREED UPON. IF NNAS SHOULD OFFER ACCEPTABLY FORMULATED INITIATIVE, WE BELIEVE NATO SHOULD SUPPORT IT. IF INITIAL NNA PROPOSAL IS UNACCEPTABLE OR INADEQUATE, WE BELIEVE NATO SHOULD SUGGEST TO NNAS ALTERNATIVE FORMULATION

WHICH IT COULD SUPPORT. ALTHOUGH WE SEE NO ADVANTAGE IN ALLIANCE ADVOCACY OF A MOVEMENTS CBM, WE RESERVE OUR POSITION ON QUESTION WHETHER UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES ALLIES MIGHT WISH TO CONSIDER INITIATIVE ON MOVEMENTS THEMSELVES, AS SOME ALLIES PROPOSE. WE ARE CONTINUING OUR EFFORTS TO DEFINE THE PARAMETERS WITHIN WHICH A RESPONSE TO THE NNAS COULD BE MADE WHICH WOULD BE ACCEPTABLE TO THE US GOVERNMENT.

B. "WE FURTHER BELIEVE INFORMING THE NNAS IN APPROPRIATE FASHION IN ADVANCE 1) OF ALLIED WILLINGNESS TO SUPPORT AN NNA MOVEMENTS INITIATIVE AND 2) OF THE ACCEPTABLE PARAMETERS, ONCE ALLIED AGREEMENT HAS BEEN REACHED ON THEM, COULD ENCOURAGE THE NNAS TO ADVANCE CONSTRUCTIVE
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 04 STATE 206179

INITIATIVES.

C. QUOTE WE WILL CONSULT WITH THE ALLIES AS SOON AS WORK HAS BEEN COMPLETED ON A PARAMETERS DRAFT SINCE THEIR COMMENTS WOULD BE MOST HELPFUL IN CONCLUDING THE FINAL US POSITION. UNQUOTE

3. MISSION SHOULD NOT DEVELOP THE STATEMENT FURTHER, IF QUESTIONS ARE ASKED, BUT MAY USE WHATEVER SECTIONS OF THE BACKGROUND IN PARAGRAPH ONE ABOVE IT FEELS WOULD BE APPROPRIATE IN PROVIDING SOME FURTHER CLARIFICATION.

FYI: WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF REWORKING THE FIRST DRAFT OF A PAPER ON MAJOR MOVEMENTS. WE WOULD HOPE TO FORWARD IT TO THE MISSION FOR ALLIED (INCLUDING MILITARY COMMITTEE) COMMENTS WHICH WE WOULD TAKE INTO ACCOUNT IN DEVELOPING OUR FINAL POSITION. END FYI.

4. CONCERNING PARAGRAPH 2 OF REFTTEL A, WE OF COURSE AGREE WITH ALLIES THAT WE SHOULD NOT BECOME INVOLVED IN A DEBATE WITH THE EAST ON NUMBERS OF MANEUVERS. WE BELIEVE, HOWEVER, IT WOULD BE FOOLISH TO ARRIVE AT BELGRADE WITHOUT SOME FACTS AND FIGURES AVAILABLE TO RESPOND TO ANY SOVIET GRANDSTANDING WITH NNAS AND MEDIA ON MANEUVERS LIMITATIONS AND OTHER SUBJECTS. ALLIED REPRESENTATIVES SHOULD AT LEAST BE IN A POSITION TO MAKE AVAILABLE TO THE NNAS OR MEDIA, IF REQUIRED A SET OF IMMEDIATELY AVAILABLE FIGURES WHICH COULD BELIEVE SOVIET CHARGES. MISSION SHOULD THEREFORE AGAIN SEEK TO HAVE INCLUDED IN THE REVISED ISD/141 A REQUEST TO SACEUR FOR DATA ALONG THE LINES OF PARAGRAPH 2B OF REFTTEL D.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 05 STATE 206179

5. IF APPROPRIATE, MISSION MAY NOTE THAT THREE

POSSIBLE INITIATIVES LISTED BY THE FRG, I.E., 10-15,000
TROOP NOTIFICATION THRESHOLD, IMPROVEMENT OBSERVER
TREATMENT AND MOVEMENTS SHOULD BE IN THE TOP SECTION
OF ANY ALLIED PRIORITY LIST OF INITIATIVES TO ADVANCE
AND SUPPORT. FYI: WE HOPE SHORTLY TO BE ABLE TO
PREPARE OUR OWN TENTATIVE PRIORITY LIST AS A RESULT
OF THE INTERIM MOVEMENTS POSITION ABOVE. END FYI.

6. THE MISSION SUGGESTION FOR A DEMARCHE IN RELUCTANT
ALLIED CAPITALS ON SETTING CBM STRENGTHENING INITIATIVE
PRIORITIES (PARAGRAPH EIGHT OF REFTEL A) IS SOUND.
WE PLAN TO MAKE SUCH AN APPROACH ON CBM PRIORITIES
(AND POSSIBLY ON OTHER BASKET PRIORITIES AS WELL)
AFTER RECEIPT OF POLADS REACTION TO OUR INTERIM
MOVEMENTS POSITION AND OTHER INITIATIVES.

VANCE UNQUOTE.

VANCE

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: ALLIANCE, COMMITTEE MEETINGS, COLLECTIVE SECURITY AGREEMENTS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Sent Date: 29-Aug-1977 12:00:00 am
Decaption Date: 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 22 May 2009
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1977STATE206179
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: JCKORNBLUM
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: GS
Errors: N/A
Expiration:
Film Number: D770312-0422
Format: TEL
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1977/newtext/t19770811/aaaaajem.tel
Line Count: 196
Litigation Code IDs:
Litigation Codes:
Litigation History:
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Message ID: 960c2250-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Office: ORIGIN EUR
Original Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: CONFIDENTIAL
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: 77 NATO BRUSSELS 4985, 77 NATO BRUSSELS 4565, 77 STATE 75283, 77 STATE 130422
Retention: 0
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 14-Mar-2005 12:00:00 am
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review Media Identifier:
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
SAS ID: 1432204
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: CSCE/CBMS: JUNE 14 POLADS MEETING FOLLOWING IS A REPEAT QTE
TAGS: MARR, PGOV, XS, XT, XG, CSCE, NATO
To: USNMR SHAPE
Type: TE
vdkgvwkey: odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS_Docs/960c2250-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc
Review Markings:
Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
22 May 2009
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009